

Solving the clique cover problem on (bull, C_4)-free graphs*

Kathie Cameron¹

Chính T. Hoàng²

¹ Department of Mathematics, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 3C5

kcameron@wlu.ca

² Department of Physics and Computer Science, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 3C5

choang@wlu.ca

Abstract

We give an $O(n^4)$ algorithm to find a minimum clique cover of a (bull, C_4)-free graph, or equivalently, a minimum colouring of a (bull, $2K_2$)-free graph, where n is the number of vertices of the graphs.

1 Background

A *hole* is a chordless cycle with at least four vertices, and is called odd or even depending on whether the number of vertices is odd or even. As usual, we will use C_k to denote the hole with k vertices. The *bull* is the graph consisting of a C_3 together with two additional vertices of degree 1 adjacent to distinct vertices of the C_3 . Where H is a graph, a graph G is called *H-free* if G has no induced subgraph isomorphic to H . Where $\mathcal{H}$ is a set of graphs, a graph G is called *H-free* if it is H -free for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$. In particular, (bull, C_4)-free graphs are the graphs which have no induced bulls or C_4 s. Where X is a subset of the vertices of a graph G , we use $G[X]$ to denote the subgraph of G induced by X .

Let G be a graph. A *clique cover* of G is a set of cliques of G such that every vertex is in at least one of them. The *clique cover number* is the minimum size of a clique cover, and is denoted by $\theta(G)$. The clique cover number of G equals the chromatic number of its complement, $\overline{G}$. (Note that the minimum size of a clique cover equals the minimum size of a partition of the vertices into cliques. Somewhat strangely, graph theorists tend to think of partitions into stable sets and coverings (rather than partitions) by cliques, although in each case, it is

*Research support by Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

clear that given a covering one can obtain a partition whose size is no bigger.) Let $m(G)$ denote the number of edges in a largest matching of G . If G is triangle-free, a minimum clique cover of G consists of a maximum matching together with the vertices not covered by the matching, and so $\theta(G) = |V(G)| - m(G)$.

A graph is called *chordal* if it has no holes. A vertex is called *simplicial* if its neighbours induce a clique.

Theorem 1.1 (Dirac [3]) *Let G be a chordal graph. Then G is a clique or contains two non-adjacent simplicial vertices.*

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. An *amalgam* partition of G is a partition of V into disjoint sets K, A_1, B_1, A_2, B_2 such that:

- (i) $A_1 \neq \emptyset, A_2 \neq \emptyset$,
- (ii) K induces a (possibly empty) clique,
- (iii) $|A_i \cup B_i| \geq 2$ for $i = 1, 2$,
- (iv) there are all possible edges between A_1 and A_2 ,
- (v) there are all possible edges between K and A_i for $i = 1, 2$,
- (vi) there are no edges between B_i and $A_j \cup B_j$ for $i \neq j$.

We will refer to such a partition by the tuple (K, A_1, B_1, A_2, B_2) .

Two vertices are called *true twins* if they are adjacent and they have the same neighbours other than each other. Vertex x is said to *dominate* vertex y if every neighbour of y other than x is a neighbour of x . We say that G is *reducible* if it has adjacent vertices x and y such that x dominates y . A *universal vertex* is a vertex which is adjacent to all other vertices. Note that a universal vertex dominates all other vertices. Note also that if a graph G is a clique, then every vertex dominates every other vertex. If v is a simplicial vertex and K is its neighbour-set, then any vertex $k \in K$ dominates v . Thus, by Dirac's Theorem 1.1, a chordal graph is reducible.

A *cap* is a hole together with an additional vertex which is adjacent to two adjacent vertices of the hole. Note that a (bull, C_4) -free graph is cap-free. A *basic* cap-free graph G is either a chordal graph or a biconnected triangle-free graph together with at most one additional vertex, which is adjacent to all other vertices of G .

Theorem 1.2 (Conforti, Cornuéjols, Kapoor, and Vušković (Thm. 4.1 in [1])) *A cap-free graph which is not basic contains an amalgam.*

Note that an irreducible basic graph can not have a universal vertex or be chordal, so it must be a biconnected triangle-free graph.

In this paper, we will show that there is a polynomial-time algorithm to find a minimum clique cover of a (bull, C_4)-free graph. Since the bull is self-complementary, this is equivalent to finding a minimum colouring of a (bull, $2K_2$)-free graph, where $2K_2$ is the graph consisting of two independent edges.

Let P_k denote the chordless path on k vertices. The *house* is $\overline{P_5}$. The class of (bull, C_4)-free graphs is a subclass of (bull, house)-free graphs, which is a subclass of cap-free graphs. The complexity of the clique cover problem is unknown for (bull, house)-free graphs and for cap-free graphs.

A *k-clique-cover* is a clique cover with at most k cliques (that is, a clique cover of size at most k). A *k-clique-cover* (more precisely, a *k-clique-partition*) of a graph corresponds to a *k-colouring* of its complement (that is, a colouring with at most k colours). There is a polynomial-time algorithm for *k-clique-cover* in (bull, C_4)-free graphs [7]. To explain this, we need some definitions.

An *asteroidal triple* or *AT* in a graph G is a stable set of three vertices such that between any two, there is a path avoiding the neighbour-set of the third. A graph is *AT-free* if it has no asteroidal triples. As mentioned above, the clique cover problem for (bull, C_4)-free graphs is equivalent to the colouring problem for (bull, $2K_2$)-free graphs. The class of (bull, $2K_2$)-free graphs is a subclass of (bull, P_5)-free graphs which are AT-free. Finding a polynomial-time algorithm for colouring AT-free graphs is a long-standing open problem. Stacho [11] gave an $O(n^2m) \leq O(n^4)$ algorithm for deciding if an AT-free graph is 3-colourable, and if so, finding a 3-colouring, where n is the number of vertices and m is the number of edges of the input graph. Kratsch and Müller [7] gave an $O(n^{8k+2})$ algorithm for *k-colouring* AT-free graphs. This is polynomial for fixed k . Stacho's algorithm solves 3-clique cover and Kratsch and Müller's algorithm solves *k-clique-cover* for complements of AT-free graphs, and thus for (bull, C_4)-free graphs. Our algorithm can be considered a contribution toward solving the colouring problem for AT-free graphs.

We focus on the clique cover problem for (bull, C_4)-free graphs because the complexities of three other fundamental problems - largest clique, stability number and chromatic number - are known. The class of C_4 -free graphs is known to have a polynomial number of maximal cliques [4] and thus the maximum clique and even the maximum weight clique can be found in polynomial time for graphs in this class and thus also for the subclass of (bull, C_4)-free graphs. The class of (C_3, C_4) -free graphs is a subclass of (bull, C_4)-free graphs. Chromatic number [6] and stability number [10] are NP-hard for (C_3, C_4) -free graphs and thus these problems are also NP-hard for the superclass of (bull, C_4)-free graphs.

2 The results

Theorem 2.1 *Let G be a connected (bull, C_4)-free graph. Then one of the following holds.*

- (i) G is reducible.
- (ii) G is basic.

(iii) G has a one-point cutset.

Proof. Let G be a (bull, C_4) -free graph. Then G is cap-free. Suppose G is irreducible and not basic. We will show that G has a one-point cutset. By Theorem 1.2, G contains an amalgam (K, A_1, B_1, A_2, B_2) . If each A_i contains two non-adjacent vertices (for $i = 1, 2$), then there is a C_4 in $A_1 \cup A_2$. Thus, w.l.o.g, we may assume A_2 is a clique. Suppose that $|A_2| \geq 2$. Then B_2 is non-empty, for otherwise, any two vertices in A_2 are true twins and so G is reducible, a contradiction. Consider a vertex $a_1 \in A_1$. The vertex a_1 must have a neighbour b_1 in B_1 , for otherwise, any vertex $a_2 \in A_2$ dominates a_1 , a contradiction. Consider two vertices $x, y \in A_2$. Since G is irreducible, there must be a vertex z that is adjacent to x but not to y . The vertex z must lie in B_2 . But now $G[\{b_1, a_1, x, y, z\}]$ is a bull, a contradiction. So we have $|A_2| = 1$ and therefore $|B_2| \geq 1$.

Suppose that $K \neq \emptyset$. Consider vertices $k \in K$ and $x \in A_2$. Since G is irreducible, there must be a vertex z that is adjacent to x but not to k . The vertex z is necessarily in B_2 . A vertex $a_1 \in A_1$ must have a neighbour b that is not adjacent to k since G is irreducible. The vertex b must lie in B_1 . But now $G[\{z, x, k, a_1, b\}]$ is a bull. So, K is an empty set. Now, A_2 is a one-point cutset of G . $\square$

Theorem 2.2 *Let G be a connected, irreducible (bull, C_4) -free graph with a one-point cutset v . Then the neighbourhood of v is a stable set.*

Proof. Enumerate the components of $G - v$ as $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_t$. Define $N_i = N(v) \cap C_i$. We only need to prove that N_i is a stable set. Note that each vertex $x \in N_i$ must have a neighbour in $M_i = C_i - N_i$ since otherwise v dominates x . In particular, $M_i \neq \emptyset$. Let us assume that N_i is not a stable set. Consider a component C of $G[N_i]$ with at least two vertices.

Claim: For any two adjacent vertices $x, y \in C$, $N(x) \cap M_i = N(y) \cap M_i$.

Proof. If the claim is false then there is a vertex $z \in M_i$ that is adjacent to x but not to y (or, vice versa). But now $G[\{z, x, y, v, c_j\}]$ is a bull for a neighbour c_j of v in C_j with $j \neq i$. The claim is justified.

Now, C must be a clique, for otherwise, consider two non-adjacent vertices $x, y \in C$. There is a path P in C joining x and y . By the claim, adjacent vertices of P have the same neighbours in M_i . It follows that all vertices of P have the same neighbours in M_i . As mentioned above, there is always at least one such neighbour. Thus x and y have a common neighbour, say z in M_i , and then $G[\{v, x, y, z\}]$ is a C_4 , a contradiction. Since C is a clique, any two vertices of C form a pair of true twins, a contradiction. Thus each component C of $G[N_i]$ is a single vertex and so N_i is a stable set. $\square$

Let v be a one-point cutset of G . Let the components of $G - v$ be $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_t$. Define $f(v) = \text{minimum } \{|C_i| : i = 1, 2, \dots, t\}$. We say that v is *terminal* if there is a component C_i such that $C_i \cup \{v\}$ induces a triangle-free basic graph. We now strengthen Theorem 2.1 to the following:

Theorem 2.3 *Let G be a connected (bull, C_4)-free graph. Then one of the following holds .*

- (i) G is reducible.
- (ii) G is basic.
- (iii) G has a terminal one-point cutset.

Proof. Let G be a connected (bull, C_4)-free graph. Suppose G is irreducible and not basic. By Theorem 2.1, G has a one-point cutset. Among all one-point cutsets of G , choose the one, v , with the smallest $f(v)$. Let C_i be a component of $G - v$ with $f(v) = |C_i|$. Let G_i be the subgraph of G induced by $C_i \cup \{v\}$. By Theorem 2.2, the neighbourhood N_i of v in G_i is a stable set. Every vertex $u \in N_i$ must have a neighbour in $M_i = C_i - (N_i \cup \{v\})$, for otherwise v dominates u in G , a contradiction. We have $|N_i| \geq 2$, for otherwise, the unique neighbour v' of v is a one-point cutset of G_i , and it is also a one-point cutset of G with $f(v') < f(v)$, a contradiction to the minimality of $f(v)$. By Theorem 2.1, G_i is reducible, basic, or has an one-point cutset.

Suppose G_i has a one-point cutset v_i . Then, v_i is also a one-point cutset of G with $f(v_i) < f(v)$, a contradiction to the minimality of v . So G_i cannot have a one-point cutset.

Suppose G_i is reducible and has no one-point cutset. Let x and y be two adjacent vertices in G_i such that x dominates y . Since N_i is a stable set of size at least two, no vertex in N_i can dominate v , that is, $y \neq v$. If $y \in N_i$, then x is necessarily v , and so x dominates y in G , a contradiction. Thus, y is in M_i and so it has no neighbours in $G - G_i$. But now x dominates y in G , a contradiction.

Thus G_i is basic, irreducible and has no one-point cutset. Since G_i is irreducible and basic, it must be triangle-free. Thus v is a terminal one-point cutset. $\square$

Remark. We can find in polynomial-time a terminal one-point cutset if one exists in $O(nm)$ time, where, as usual, n , respectively, m , is the number of vertices, respectively, edges, of the input graph.

Remark. For a triangle-free graph G , there is a polynomial-time algorithm to find $\theta(G)$. (Find a maximum matching.)

Theorem 2.4 *There is a polynomial-time algorithm to find a minimum clique cover for a (bull, C_4)-free graph.*

Proof. Let G be a (bull, C_4)-free graph. We may assume that G is connected. If G contains adjacent vertices x and y such that x dominates y then we remove x from G , and it is easy to see that $\theta(G) = \theta(G - x)$. We repeatedly remove such vertices x until G becomes irreducible. If G is basic then it is triangle-free, and we can compute $\theta(G)$ directly.

Now, suppose G has a terminal one-point cutset v . Let C_i be a component of $G - v$ such that the subgraph G_i of G induced by $C_i \cup \{v\}$ is triangle-free. Let G' be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices in $G - C_i$. Compute $m(G_i)$

and $m(G_i - v)$. If $m(G_i) = m(G_i - v)$, then there is a minimum clique cover $\mathcal{C}$ of G_i such that $\{v\}$ is a member of $\mathcal{C}$. We have thus $\theta(G) = \theta(G') + \theta(G_i - v)$. We can recursively compute $\theta(G')$ to determine $\theta(G)$. Now, we may assume $m(G_i) = m(G_i - v) + 1$. This means for every maximum matching $\mathcal{M}$ of G_i , some edge of $\mathcal{M}$ is incident to v . In other words, for any minimum clique cover $\mathcal{C}$ of G_i , the vertex v belongs to a clique (of $\mathcal{C}$) of size 2. Thus we have $\theta(G_i) = \theta(G_i - v)$. It follows that $\theta(G) = \theta(G' - v) + \theta(G_i)$. We can recursively compute $\theta(G' - v)$ to determine $\theta(G)$. Since the recursion is done at most n times, the algorithm is polynomial. $\square$

Complexity of the algorithm.

We can check if G is connected in $O(n+m)$ time, and if not, apply the algorithm to each component of G .

For each vertex x and for each neighbor y of x , we can check in $O(m)$ time if x dominates y , or vice versa. Thus, we can find a dominating vertex, if one exists, in $O(nm)$ time.

We can check if the remaining graph H is triangle-free in $O(n^\alpha)$ time, where α is the complexity of matrix multiplication which is currently 2.3728639 [8]. If H is triangle-free, then we can find a minimum clique cover of H using the matching algorithm.

Since the graph H is irreducible, if it is not triangle-tree, then it is not basic, so by Theorem 2.3, it contains a terminal one-point cutset v . As mentioned above, a terminal one-point cutset can be found in $O(nm)$ time (by checking for each vertex v , whether it is a one-point cutset, and if so, computing the function $f(v)$ and choosing v with the smallest value $f(v)$). Where G_i is the subgraph of H induced by $C_i \cup \{v\}$, compute $m(G_i)$ and $m(G_i - v)$. This can be done in $O(\sqrt{nm})$ time [9].

Now the algorithm is iterated, at most n times.

The overall complexity is: $n[O(n+m) + O(nm) + O(n^\alpha) + O(\sqrt{nm}) + O(nm) + O(\sqrt{nm})] = O(n^2m + n^{\alpha+1}) = O(n^4)$.

3 Open problems

As mentioned in Section 1, the complexity of the clique cover problem is unknown for (bull, house)-free graphs and for two different superclasses of these: cap-free graphs and complements of AT-free graphs.

References

- [1] M. Conforti, G. Cornuéjols, A. Kapoor, and K. Vušković. Even and odd holes in cap-free graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory* 30(4)(1999), pp. 289–308.

- [2] M. Conforti, G. Cornuéjols, A. Kapoor, and K. Vušković. Even-hole-free graphs part II: Recognition algorithm. *J. Graph Theory* 40 (2002), pp. 238–266.
- [3] G. A. Dirac. On rigid circuit graphs. *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg* 25 (1961), pp. 71–76.
- [4] M. Farber. Martin On diameters and radii of bridged graphs. *Discrete Math.* 73(3) (1989), pp. 249–260.
- [5] M. C. Golumbic. Algorithmic Graph Theory and Perfect Graphs, Academic Press, New York, 1980.
- [6] D. Kral, J. Kratochvíl, Zs. Tuza, and G.J. Woeginger, Complexity of coloring graphs without forbidden induced subgraphs. WG 01, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Vol. 2204, Springer, Berlin, 2001, pp. 254–262.
- [7] D. Kratsch and H. Müller. Colouring AT-free graphs. European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA) 2012, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Vol. 7501, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012, pp. 707–718.
- [8] Le Gall, Francois. Powers of tensors and fast matrix multiplication. Proceedings of the 39th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (ISSAC 2014), arXiv:1401.7714.
- [9] S. Micali and V. Vazirani. An $O(\sqrt{|V|} \cdot |E|)$ algorithm for finding maximum matching in general graphs. Proc. 21st IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 1980, pp. 17–27.
- [10] S. Poljak. A note on the stable sets and coloring of graphs *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.* 15 (1974), pp. 307–309.
- [11] J. Stacho. 3-colouring AT-free graphs in polynomial time. *Algorithmica* 64 (2012), pp. 384–399.
- [12] R. E. Tarjan and M. Yannakakis. Simple linear-time algorithms to test chordality of graphs, test acyclicity of hypergraphs, and selectively reduce acyclic hypergraphs. *SIAM J. Computing* 13:3 (1984), pp. 566–579.
- [13] R. E. Tarjan. Decomposition by clique separators. *Discrete Math* 55 (1985), pp. 221–232.
- [14] K. Vušković. Even-hole-free graphs: A survey. *Appl. Anal. Discrete Math.* 4 (2010), pp. 219–240.
- [15] S. H. Whitesides. A method for solving certain graph recognition and optimization problems, with applications to perfect graphs, in [?].